1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 3 4 AURORE SIMS, Case No. 2:24-cv-00831-CDS-EJY 5 Plaintiff, **ORDER** 6 v. 7 ASSIA SOUILY-LEFAVE et al. 8 Defendants. 9 10 On August 23, 2024 Defendant Around Las Vegas, LLC ("Defendant") filed an Amended 11 Rule 26(f) Status Report through which the Court learned the parties successfully held a Fed. R. Civ. 12 P. 26(f) conference but could not agree on how discovery should proceed, that Defendant seeks a 13 stay of discovery, Plaintiff believes discovery should proceed, and there is a matter pending before 14 the Henderson Justice Court that may resolve issues raised in the instant matter. ECF No. 53. 15 Defendant's Status Report also explained there are proceedings in New York State courts in which 16 substantial discovery has already been done. The Court received Plaintiff's proposed discovery plan 17 and scheduling order the same day (ECF No. 55). 18 On August 26, 2024, the Court entered an Order requiring Plaintiff to respond to the 19 Amended Rule 26(f) Report no later than September 6, 2024. ECF No. 56. The Court explained to 20 Plaintiff the issues she needed to address. *Id. citing Tradebay, LLC v. ebay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597 21 (D. Nev. 2011). Plaintiff did not respond to the Court's Order. 22 The Court does not know the status of the Henderson Justice Court matter and, therefore, 23 does not know when or if issues raised in the instant action were resolved. The Court also does not 24 know what discovery occurred as a result of the Henderson action or the action or actions pending 25 in New York State. Thus, while the Court is inclined, based on what it knows, to stay discovery, 26 without more information it cannot do so.

report and submit the same no later than **September 25, 2024**, that provides:

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties **must** prepare a second joint status

27

28

- 1. confirmation that initial disclosures were exchanged in this case;
- 2. the title of the action pending in Henderson Justice Court;
- 3. the status of the Henderson Justice Court with sufficient detail so this Court may assess whether that action is duplicative of the instant action and or sufficiently related to warrant a stay of discovery;
- 4. the nature of the action or actions pending in New York State and the discovery that has been exchanged in the same; and,
- 5. what, if any, discovery is unique to this action and, therefore, must be gathered in order to allow this case to proceed to resolution.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's proposed discovery plan and scheduling order (ECF No. 55) is DENIED without prejudice for potential reconsideration once the parties provide a more complete picture of actions pending in other jurisdictions and the discovery that has taken place in those actions..

DATED this 9th day of September, 2024.

ELAYNA J. YOUCHAH (UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE